



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

M. FRIEDMANN'S "ONKELOS AND AKYLAS."

Onkelos und Akylas (III. *Jahresbericht der israelitisch-theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien für das Schuljahr 1895-1896*). By M. FRIEDMANN. (Vienna, 1896. vi + 135 pages. 8vo.)

THE learned author, whose name has become known to the public by his editions of the Mechilta, the Sifre, the Pesikta-rabbathi, and by other works, treats in the essay under discussion on several questions relating to the Bible. The title says, on the one hand, too little, the first of the four chapters being, as a sort of introduction, devoted to the problem of Bible translations, and dealing with the Septuagint, the Aristeas letter and several other topics. But, on the other hand, the title is too wide, in as far as the next three chapters, in spite of their comparative comprehensiveness, do not exhaust the subject. Thus one looks in vain for a description of the character of Aquila's version, and the author leaves the principal source, the Hexapla, quite unnoticed. We shall see in the course of our discussion that the author has no proper idea of it, and that he draws his material exclusively from Jewish literature.

After the introduction, the author produces in the second chapter the Jewish traditions about Akylas; passages from his translations are quoted, and other points discussed. The third chapter is devoted to the Targum-Onkelos and to the institution of translation at large, whilst other matters, relating more or less to the principal theme, are taken account of. In the last chapter, the Rabbinical traditions about Onkelos and the critique on them up to the present day are passed in review, and the results of the whole inquiry are summarized. This brief summary of the contents—the author gives a very minute one—shows that by a more compressed treatment chapters two and four might have been united, and thus many repetitions and cross-references avoided. The essay would have lost in bulk, but by no means in intrinsic value.

A brief exposition of the various opinions on the questions under discussion would have facilitated a survey of the whole, instead of which Friedmann gives too frequent quotations from modern works, often filling whole pages. If the author had also deemed the most recent works worthy of consideration, his essay would not have remained, in many points, behind the present state of investigation. This refers especially to the first part of the essay, as will be seen presently.

Friedmann, at the very commencement of his essay (p. 2), gives it as his opinion that there existed, beside the Greek and Aramaic versions,

also an Egyptian, Median, Elamite, and Iberian version. He quotes Sabbath, 115 a, and Megilla, 17 a; and also observes that עברית לעבריים could not have been an error instead of ערבית, and adds: "I therefore conjecture that Iberia is meant here." Friedmann has taken no notice of my introduction to the Old Testament (*Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*), which appeared in the year 1894. I endeavoured in that work, pp. 84-99, in a chapter headed "Lost Versions of the Bible," to prove, from a number of expressions occurring in the tradition and from other data, the former existence of translations into several languages of antiquity, and not only into those mentioned.

Acta Apost., II, 5-11 (*Zur Einleitung*, p. 97) is also particularly instructive. The still existing Coptic Bible is probably of Jewish origin (*ibid.* 92 sq.)¹. Hebrew Bibles, written with foreign characters, may also have existed in antiquity² (*ibid.* 80-84). Thus, the second column of the Hexapla, which, as it is known, contains the Hebrew text in Greek transcription, hails from Jews, and not from Origen. The latter has found it ready to hand in the same way as the Greek versions. The conjecture that עברית had to be altered into ערבית was made by Prof. Bacher and Prof. Strack (*Magyar Zsidó Szemle*, 1894, pp. 520 sqq. and 641); that עברית meant Iberia was conjectured by Krauss (*ibid.* 1895, p. 493).

All Talmudical passages on the biblical versions were cited by me in my essay, and a reference to p. 84 sqq. would—to say the least—have done no harm, and Friedmann's information on pp. 15-21 could, in that case, have been said in much less words. On p. 19 reference ought to have been made to Masechet Sefarims, i. 8 in שלשה ספרים כתב בכל נפתחים ed. S. Schönblum (Lemberg, 1877), where we read הלשונות בכל הכתובין כולם אין קורין בו (*Zur Einleitung*, p. 81, note 3). Friedmann should also have mentioned, in this connexion, the sayings about the reading of the Megilla, and not have confined himself to 20, note 1 (cf. *ibid.* 70 sqq.). We look also in vain on p. 20 for a reference to Joel's acute observations in *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte* (Breslau, 1880), where the Talmudic statements on the Greek versions of the Bible, and the "various views of the doctors of the Talmud about the Greek language" are discussed. That dissertation is not noted by Friedmann at all, neither in this place nor in the last part of his essay

¹ J. Bachmann published in 1893 a book entitled *Die Klagelieder Jeremiae in der Aethiopischen Bibelübersetzung*. That version also seems to have been made after the original Hebrew text.

² Even though I consider my explanation of Sabbath, 115 a (*Zur Einleitung*, 81), open to objections, sufficient proof still remains of my assertion.

where he mentions a summary of the "opinions on the Onkelos-Akylas question" (pp. 105-131). I cannot enter, within the limits of a review, upon the material differences on this point, and must leave it to the reader to compare the works quoted with that of Friedmann. It certainly cannot be justified that previous inquiries were disregarded, especially when a summary of them is being offered, and thus the author's work is already antiquated on its very appearance.

Nor can the rest of Friedmann's observations in this chapter be called happy. To give only a few examples. We read, p. 19, the following words about the Beraitha, Megilla, 9 a, which contains the well-known narrative of the alterations made by the seventy-two wise men for Ptolemy: "If this passage be read without the discussion that precedes it in the Talmud, no trace can be detected which pointed to a translation, &c." But how, in that case, is the alteration of ארנבת into צעירת הרגלים to be explained? If the Greek "lagos" be not alluded to, which might have been considered to reflect on the royal family of the "Lagides," as expressly stated in the Talmud (מפני שאשתו של תלמי ארנבת שמה), the original designation of ארנבת as an unclean animal might have safely been retained (Lev. xi. 6 and Deut. xiv. 7). Cf. on the whole narrative Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 439 sqq. Friedmann persists, on the ground of the Talmudical source, that the seventy-two scholars had written for Ptolemy a Hebrew copy of the Bible. He also finds a proof for this opinion in the well-known passage: שלשה ספרים נמצאו בעזרה אחד של מעונים ואחד של היא (Sifre, II, p. 148 b and elsewhere). Without being able to explain what ועטוטים means, he makes of it a Hebrew-Alexandrian copy, which found its way into the temple, where standard copies were preserved! "The quoted passage proves that much with certainty, that the alterations were made in the Hebrew text, and not merely in the translation" (ibid.). He who reads the Talmudical narratives with an unprejudiced mind will notice at once that they are an echo of the letter of Aristeeas. Since Friedmann considers this letter to be genuine, one cannot understand why he takes all that trouble. The "clinching proof" from Sifre, § 148, p. 104 a, ed. Friedmann, finds a better explanation for every critic according to Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 446.

The author turns next to the question (pp. 25-29) whether the weekly portion was read in Alexandria from the Torah, and, if so, in which language? I have shown in *Zur Einleitung*, p. 86 sq., that the weekly portion was read in the Greek language, also in the Graeco-Jewish congregations of Palestine. Besides other sources, I referred to Tosefta Megilla, 4, 13, where we read that

"in the synagogues of those Jews who spoke a strange language, they commence and conclude with Hebrew if there is anybody who can read to them; but if there is no one who can read (=Hebrew) to them, in that case only one reads." The further proofs for this rendering, and the inferences drawn from it, are given *ibid.* note 2. This Tosefta escaped the notice of Frankel, and of Friedmann also. It is quite erroneous to refer the injunctions of the Mishnah in respect to לעזויות to foreign Jews, as is done by Friedmann also, p. 27, because Jews of different nationalities lived in the Holy Land itself, which appears from the passage in *Acta Apostolorum*, quoted above. There were Hellenistic-Jewish congregations, especially in the numerous Hellenic towns of Palestine. (Cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*², II, 51-131, on the Hellenic cities.) Friedmann arrives, by means of a bold imagination, at the following propositions:—"The Greek version was, as we have shown, introduced by Ptolemy from political motives. The original text was, as a matter of fact, excluded from public worship. Private copies were then composed, for the most part, from the official copy of Ptolemy, it not being generally known that it did not accord with the original text. When a change took place in the political conditions, and especially after the Maccabean restoration, a healthy reaction made itself felt, supported also by continuous fresh emigrations from Palestine, and people turned again to the original text. The Septuagint was made use of in teaching, in lectures, in private reading, and in intercourse with heathens" (p. 29). Friedmann has not given any historical proof of a single one of these propositions; they are one and all without foundation.

The author suffers himself to be carried away by entirely modern situations and opinions when he assumes the Septuagint to have been prepared by order of the king on the ground of political motives. He says, pp. 14-15: "This enigma finds its solution in the assumption of a pressure from without having been brought to bear on account of political motives; which consisted in a desire of Hellenizing the Jews and turning them into complete Greeks. This would tend to strengthen the Egyptian government, to neutralize their gravitation towards Palestine; otherwise inducements might be held out to them from Syria to gain them over to the Syrian schemes. It is most likely that Jewish brains may have assisted to cause this idea to appear plausible in the eyes of the government. The mode adopted in Egypt was to make the Jews feel flattered by it, and to make it appear to them as a glorification of their religion, as a Kiddush-Hashem. But this is the weakest point in the character of the Jews, and the most assailable, for the Jew is vain of his

religion. Every one who reads the Bible with open eyes will find out this vanity. For this very reason it is quite natural that this translation was, from a non-Jewish side, encircled by a halo."

I will not enter upon his defence of the genuineness of the Aristeas letter on the ground that the opposite opinion, as expressed especially by König, in agreement with all scholars, was quite illogical and only contained attacks on the Jews (p. 7). It is a pity that a scholar like König in Rostock, who takes all possible pains to give a chance to Jewish literature also, who has never uttered a word in disparagement of the Jews, is met with the innuendo that his conclusion, if expressed in the style common in modern times, would sound: "The whole story is nothing but a Jewish swindle"¹. Friedmann forgets that both in ancient times and in the Middle Ages an enormous pseudo-epigraphical literature was produced, without exciting much censure against the Christians or the Jews. Frankel also declared the letter in question as a "pious fraud." It is true Friedmann asks on p. 11, "But why a *pious* fraud?" It is to be hoped that this is no *pia fraus* on his part.

The author's notion about the extensive use of the Aramaic language in Palestine is antiquated. He touches the subject twice. He asserts that the Jews had brought the Aramaic language with them from Babylon² (p. 57). "We see that in later times Aramaic had become entirely the popular language by constant immigrations from Babylon, and Meturgemans were universally employed for the interpretation of the weekly portion" (p. 13). This was the opinion of de Rossi, Zunz (*Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. 7 sq.), and others; an opinion which was long since refuted by modern scholars. The Aramaic dialect of Palestine was not the East-Aramaic, but the West-Aramaic dialect; and it was impossible for the Babylonian exiles to bring with them from the land of their captivity a language that was not spoken there at all. For further information about this question, see particularly, Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (1884), p. 4 sqq.; Schürer, *Geschichte*², II, p. 8, note 26; Dalman, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-palästinensischen Aramäisch, Einleitung*, particularly 31-33.

¹ It is painful to find criticism reproached with "declaring Tradition *a priori* to be a swindle and a deception" (p. 27). Friedmann often allows himself to be carried away by his ardent temperament, e. g. on p. 26, and it is to this that we ascribe the biting reflections on Rappoport, Frankel, and other scholars that have highly distinguished themselves in learning, and I hope that the learned author will not have any followers in this particular direction, although he had plenty of predecessors.

² Cf. also p. 128, where Friedmann considers Aramaic to have been the language of the educated classes in Palestine.

The reader is peculiarly impressed in reading further, on p. 57, that the idiom imported from Babylon had been "corrupted by the Palestinian Sorsi—סורסי." Thus the Palestinian-Aramaic language of the land continued to exist, but corrupted by the influence of the Babylonian-Aramaic dialect.

The extent to which the author draws on his imagination can be seen on p. 58, where we read literally: "We possess a report in the Talmud (Sanhedrin, 21 b, in the name of מר זוטרא or מר עוקבא), that Ezra had intended to deliver the Torah to the people in Aramaic—the Hebrew text was to be preserved by the priests in the temple. But the Israelites insisted on the original text being delivered to the people—בִּירְרוּ לָהֶן כֶּתֶב אִשּׁוּרִית וְלִשׁוֹן הַקֹּדֶשׁ." Nothing of all this is said in the Talmud; there it is said only "that the Torah had been revealed the first time in Hebrew writing and in the holy language, and the second time, at the time of Ezra, in Assyrian writing and Aramaic language; upon this Israel preferred having Assyrian writing and the holy language, leaving the Hebrew writing and Aramaic language to the *Ioliotoi*." This assertion of the Amora is nothing but a reproduction in a pleasant form of Tannaitic references, as I have shown in *Zur Einleitung*, pp. 52–57. Friedmann, after having smuggled the above statement into the Talmud—another description is unsuitable to this mode of interpretation—takes a bold step forward and infers from this Talmudical passage "that the whole of the Aramaic translation was already in existence at the time of Ezra's return from Babylon" (ibid. note 2)¹. But even this does not satisfy him, and he asserts that this whole proceeding is contained in Neh. viii. 1, 2 sqq. But this is nothing but the passing off of homily for science.

Having discussed those points of the third chapter that belong to the subject dealt with in the first, we now turn to the second chapter which deals with Akylas. One would expect here studies from the Hexapla, the third column of which contains, as is known, the version of Aquila; but no such thing. The author has no proper idea either of the fragments that are still extant of that version or of the Hexapla. He says, on p. 50: "Only scanty remnants of this work (the Hexapla) were preserved in *Quotations of the Fathers of the Church*"². Origen lived after the author, about 300" (ibid.). It seems that Friedmann had not before him the two copious volumes of Field's *Hexapla*.

¹ Does Friedmann believe, on the ground of a simple assertion in Baba Kama, 82 a, that Ezra introduced the ten institutions mentioned there? The narrative of an Amora, 700 years after the event, cannot be taken as historical evidence.

² The italics are mine.

As to the main questions concerning that version, I consider all conjectures that are proposed without a thorough study of the existing fragments as idle talk. A correct judgment about the method applied in Aquila's version and its sources can only be arrived at after a systematic comparison of Akylas's translations with the information contained in the Jewish tradition; especially with the Tannaite texts as given in Mechilta, Sifre, Sifre Zutta, Sifra, in both Talmuds, in the other Midrashim, and in the Targums. I am thoroughly convinced that a fresh and complete inquiry of the material in the direction designated here, including the question which of the Tannaites was chiefly followed by Akylas, would throw much light on the subject. I have investigated the divergences between Akylas's first and second version from this point of view, but the data at present at hand are too few to make a correct estimate possible, particularly since in the Jewish tradition also only fragments of the Tannaite exegesis are contained. For that which was considered as plain commentary found no place in the Talmud, in the first place, because it was not controversial, and, in the second place, because it was known to every one. But even the researches that have hitherto been made ought to be sufficient to prove the correctness of the assumption that Akylas translated in Akiba's spirit. For, in the first place, he translates *etymologically*, and, secondly, he translates *every syllable and every letter*, as was already pointed out by Jerome (*Epist.* 57, ad Pammachium, c. 11 = Vallarsi i. 316; the character of Akylas's version is fully described by Field, *Hexapla*, pp. xvi-xxvii). This method can only have its origin in the style of Akiba's exegesis, which "derives large numbers of Halachot from every little stroke" (*Menachot*, 29 b). The inference, therefore, that Aquila had translated in the spirit of R. Akiba, is not merely drawn from the fact that he translated the *nota accusativi* אֲנִי with *σὺν*, but from the *whole method of his hermeneutics*. In the face of this fact there is no reason whatever to doubt, as Friedmann does (p. 33), the accuracy of the statements of the Talmud, j. Kiddushin, i. 1, and of Jerome, *Comment. in Isaiam*, viii. 11, according to which Akylas had been a disciple of R. Akiba. For Friedmann holds that the words "Akylas translated before Rabbi Akiba" do not prove that he had been his disciple, but that it only showed that they were contemporaries. But in the note he admits that "the expression תְּרַגְּמֵי לְפָנָי only expresses that Akylas deported himself in regard to R. Akiba like a disciple." This is playing with the words. If Akylas translated before Akiba, it does not only mean that he *occasionally* translated *one* word, but that he translated frequently, although the Talmud had no occasion to communicate several translations.

Further, since Akiba did not need a Greek translation of the Bible, the phrase "he translated before him" cannot mean anything else but that Akylas wished to have the accuracy of his version tested by Akiba, a thing which would not very well have been possible without a knowledge of Akiba's method of exegesis. It must also be observed that, in the Talmudical sense of the word, a pupil need not be younger than the master, a fact very well known to Friedmann, for the word did not in those days mean the same as "pupil" in the present day, a person who had instruction from his master in the lower, middle, or higher school, but the designation applied to any one who went to the house of study of a master whom he recognized as superior to himself and whose lectures he attended. If then Friedmann insists (p. 33) that the participle לִמְדָּם had already been interpreted before R. Akiba, and that therefore the translation of לִמְדָּם with $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ does not prove that Akylas had been Akiba's disciple, he disregards, firstly, that the proof was not merely based on that translation of לִמְדָּם , but, as we have shown, on the whole mode of translation in a scrupulously literary manner, of which that translation of לִמְדָּם and the construction of $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ with the accusative are merely characteristic instances; and, secondly, that it is a long step from the first dawning of an exegetical method to its conscious and consistent application. If, on the one hand, it must be admitted that all methods of interpretation were not invented by R. Akiba, it must be admitted, on the other hand, that it was Akiba who referred the laws back to the Bible, in a manner that was even admired by Joshua, and assigned through this to the scriptural word and all its peculiarities such a significance that the thought needs must arise of causing the Greek version also to reflect the original text of the Bible¹.

Friedmann conjectures also that "Aquila's version owed its origin to didactic motives." "He undertook a pedagogical translation, i.e. a translation which was to produce an easy understanding of the Hebrew word, and a quick mastery of the language" (p. 49). "This translation was then introduced in all congregations that were ignorant of Hebrew, and was probably used also by parents who wished their children to be taught the Bible in Greek" (p. 50). It is the same surmise which Friedmann expresses in reference to the Aramaic version, namely, that it owed its origin to motives of instructing the youth. In spite of this he assumes the former existence

¹ Krauss (*Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstage Moritz Steinschneiders*, p. 150, n. 1) *en passant* also denies all connexion of Akylas's version with Akiba's exegesis. But he adduces no special reasons for this repudiation of a connexion believed in by all modern scholars.

of an Aramaic version of the whole of the Bible, ordained by Ezra, which, it is true, had fallen into oblivion (p. 60). In the same way, the previously rejected surmise that Akylas's version owed its existence to polemical motives is reinstated, although in different words, by a whole series of arbitrary assumptions in reference to that version (pp. 49-50), a fact of which any one who reads Friedmann's essay can convince himself. My own opinion is that the overwhelming praise which Eliezer and Joshua bestow upon Akylas can only be understood if the latter's translation was capable of rendering material services to the defence of Judaism. A written translation for the use of elementary teaching was not needed at that time, the teachers being, with few exceptions, in possession of the Hebrew tongue and perfectly well read in the Bible. Once the children had mastered a rudimentary knowledge of the Bible, the latter was taught them so that they knew it by heart. Modern conditions and educational machinery must not be transferred to those ancient times.

Space forbids entering upon other details of that chapter. I therefore observe only briefly that in the large note, p. 34, where נחמיה העמסוני is mentioned, a reference to Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 314, and to Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten*, I, 63, notes 1 and 2, would have been of use to the reader.

In the third chapter Friedmann is quite at home, and gives several noteworthy and new details¹. The principal proposition, with which I have already indicated my inability to agree, is that Ezra ordained a Targum to be made which had fallen into oblivion. His scientific courage grows as the author goes along in his inquiry, and thus, on p. 81, he is able to describe minutely the historical development of the Targumim. He says that "since Ezra the Pentateuch was read to the congregation in Hebrew and translated into Aramaic. The contents of the Pentateuch were interpreted to the people by means of the translation. They possessed for this purpose the authorized translation, of which already Ezra had made use." An Aramaic translation must, consequently, have existed already before Ezra, for it must have taken some time before it acquired authority. Now we will admit that a Targum could have been written in a very short time and authorized by—we do not know which—authorities. But we should like to have even a single historical proof of such occurrence. Friedmann holds that מפורש זה תרגום is an historical proof pointing to Ezra's time. In this way a proof could be given that the weekly portions were already read at the time of Moses.

¹ V. instances of valuable comparisons, e. g. on p. 62, n. 2; p. 65, n. 1; p. 70, n. 2. (Differences between the Massoretic text and the Midrash and Targum, &c.)

If Friedmann swears by every *dictum* of an Amora he renounces scientific research.

We only point out the following details. About the names of the Jewish-Aramaic, cf. Dalman, l.c., p. 1, where the material is given much more completely. The designation לשון הקודש means, according to Friedmann (p. 58), "the language of the Holy One, i. e. the religious language," and is a Hebrew translation of the popular designation לשון קודשא (Targum Jon. Gen. xi. 1), which again is a shortened form for לשון בית קודשא (ibid. xxxi. 57, xlii. 23, and elsewhere). "It would be wrong to translate it 'the holy language,' for the expression is לישן קודשא, and not לישן קדיש." If Friedmann were consistent he would, in accordance with this, be obliged to translate לשון הקודש "the language of the sanctuary," a translation which I remember reading in an older author. Both translations are wrong, and arise from a misconception of the idiomatic use of the *status constructus*, which is often applied to express the adjective; cf. Ex. xvi. 23 שֶׁבֶת קֹדֶשׁ, xxii. 30 אֶנְשֵׁי קֹדֶשׁ and many more; in the Concordance s. v. קֹדֶשׁ. The word קֹדֶשׁ is used in the same way in new Hebrew, for instance, in the expressions רוח הקודש, כתבי הקודש, which clinches the question¹. We shall therefore be able henceforth to persist in translating the expression as "the holy language." Jonathan may have given in his "language of the sanctuary" a popular etymology of the phrase.

Friedmann says, p. 58, note 1, "that the Rabbinical Hebrew had its origin in Aramaic, as we shall show later." That exposition consists of an attempt to prove (pp. 67-68), in a few cases, in which Targum and Midrash agree, the priority of the Targum, because the word in question is of Aramaic origin, e. g. מִנִּין, בּוֹרִיָּה, בּוֹרִי' . Friedmann confuses here Targum with Aramaic; he seems to think that the Aramaic existed for the Tannaite—as in the present day—only in the Targum and not as a living language. The new Hebrew language did not originate with the Aramaic, as little as the language of Job arose from the Arabic; the one was only influenced and coloured by the other. Surely Friedmann would not maintain that whenever the word מִנִּין occurs in the tradition it was always

¹ Cf. also Mishna Yadayim, 3, at the end: שֶׁכָּל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ קֹדֶשׁ וְכו'. On כתבי הקודש, cf. *Zur Einleitung*, 12 sqq., according to the explanation given there the translation "divine language" would also be admissible. At any rate it is erroneous to lay stress on the substantive and not to translate it adjectively. This is also proved by the contrasted expression לשון חול (cf. Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebräischen Grammatik in Talmud und Midrasch*, p. 5).

taken from the Targum. As long as there are no proofs to the contrary, it must be assumed *a priori* that the Tannaites composed the material of their teaching in Hebrew, and spoke Aramaic only in their intercourse with the people. They first pronounced their opinions in the schools in the new Hebrew language, which they then caused to be transferred into Targum for the use of the people. This disposes of the author's proof of the age of the extant Targum.

Friedmann is not very fortunate with his linguistic observations. He explains, p. 65, note 1, דבר אחר as דיבור אחר = דְּבַר, and refers to Mechilta, at the commencement, note 1. It is not clear from the author's words whether דְּבַר אחר should be read. However, the explanation is wrong. It is true that דְּבַר occurs in Jer. v. 13, but there it applies to the Divine speech to the prophet; and Fürst¹, in his Hebrew dictionary, translates it "the Speaker, i. e. the Divine Spirit, which speaks through the prophet." In the Mechilta, at the commencement, and elsewhere it is also only used of the Divine speech. Instances ought therefore first to be given of דְּבַר being the same as דָּבָר. But even then דבר אחר could not be identified with it, because its explanation is much more simple. Namely, in many passages in the tradition דְּבַר means sentence, theorem, e.g. Aboth, iii. 8: הלומד מחברו פרק אחד או הלכה 3 vi. כל השוכח דבר אחד ממשנתו וכו' אחת או דבר אחד או אפילו אות אחת. It is evident that a פרק is divided into הלכות or into דברים, and the latter again into אותיות, which latter does not necessarily mean "letters," as is commonly assumed, but a part of a הלכה or of דבר. In the concluding sentence דבר corresponds with פסוק. It seems, therefore, that דבר formed a subdivision of פרשה, as פרק of הלכה; i. e. when Midrash was concerned they used to speak of פרשיות and דברים, and when Mishnah in a more special sense was mentioned they talked of פרקים and הלכות. But let this be as it may. The meaning of דְּבַר becomes clear from Sifre, II, 48. There we read: או' למד ב' או' כן תלמידי חכמים למד ב' או' שלשה דברים ביום, ב' ונ' פרקים בשבת, ב' ונ' פרשיות (בחורש) וכו'. We see therefore that דבר is a part of a larger whole²; and דבר אחר is nothing else; and is quite correctly translated "another word," or, as is usually done, "another explanation." On p. 55, note 4, we read

¹ In Gesenius' *Hebrew Dictionary* דְּבַר is not given; Kimchi, *Shorashim*, *radix* דבר, quotes in this sense also ה' קִהְלָה דְּבַר ה' (Hos. i. 2) and gives Tseri as the vowel.

² Since פרק is never applied to a part of a פרשה, and the word ברוח is only inserted from the Yalkut, I assume that in our passage פרקים ב' ונ' פרשיות (= פר' = ב') is a mere repetition of פרשיות.

“נמר was formed from נגם by transposition and means to learn.” Such etymologies are no longer in fashion.

The last chapter deals with the principal question of the whole inquiry; namely, whether Onkelos and Akylas must be considered as one and the same person, or as two persons. The harbinger of modern critics, Azariah de Rossi, maintained, in *Meor Enayim*, c. 45 (pp. 233–239, Vienna), that there were two translators; a Greek translator, Akylas (Aquila), and an Aramaic translator, Onkelos. Friedmann arrives at the same conclusion. The reasons given by de Rossi in support of his *new* theory are repeated by Friedmann for the purpose of upholding the *old* theory against the new criticism. The historical fact is as follows:—(1) The Palestinian sources quote on ten or eleven occasions (Friedmann, pp. 44–46; Steinschneider's *Festschrift*, German part, pp. 151 sqq.) Greek translations in the name of Akylas (עקילס). (2) The Tosefta and the Babylonian Talmud do not mention an Akylas, but an Onkelos, of whom several things are narrated, but no translations are quoted. (3) R. Jirmia's information, given in the name of Chija bar Abba, about the Greek version of Akylas in the Palestinian Talmud, Megilla, i. 9, occurs, with some alterations, in the Babylonian Talmud, Megilla, 3 a. (4) The Talmud does not know of an Aramaic Targum under the name of Onkelos, and the first quotations under this name occur only in the works of the later Gaons (Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, II, p. 176, note 4).

Therefore, while Aramaic translations were known in Talmudical times, and are frequently quoted in the Talmud, but never under the name of Onkelos; and our Aramaic Targum is called the Targum of Onkelos only several centuries after the conclusion of the Talmud, and is anonymous even to commentators of a later period; there remains in support of Onkelos's authorship of an Aramaic translation only the one passage in Megilla, 3 a. None of the other data about Onkelos mention a version. The answer to the whole question turns therefore upon one single passage. Let us compare the two reports. In Jerushalmi we read: ר' ירמיה בשם ר' חיה בר בא תרגם עקילס הגר' התורה לפני ר' אליעזר ולפני ר' יהושע וקלסו אותו וא"ל יפית מבני אדם. In Babli the same report runs: ר' ירמיה ואיתימא ר' חיה בר אבא תרגום: של תורה אונקלוס הגא' אמרו מפי ר' אליעזר ור' יהושע ותרגום של נביאים יונתן בן עוזיאל אמרו מפי חגי זכריה ומלאכי ונודעוהו ארץ ישראל וכו'. A comparison shows that Jerushalmi gives an historical report, for Akylas' version actually exists, although only in fragments, up to the present day. The word התורה, as in several passages in traditional works, comprises not only the Pentateuch, but the whole Bible (*Zur Einleitung*, p. 16 sqq.). Babli gives the same information, only עקילס has become אונקלוס, and תרגם התורה, תרגום של תורה. The

cause of this alteration is obvious. The Babylonians knew no Greek translation, they thought therefore of the Aramaic translation, and, having heard of Jonathan ben Uziel's translation of the Prophets, they added תרגום של נביאים. This addition about the Prophets, as well as the narrative of miraculous commotion of the Holy Land, shows that this is not an historical report. They would have referred the Targum of the Torah also to an older authority if they had not possessed a reminiscence about the report of Chiya bar Abba. But the tradition has already become dimmed, as is evident from the circumstance that they made "Jirmiah, or, as some say, Chiya bar Abba" from "Jirmiah, in the name of Chiya bar Abba." The correctness of the Jerusalemite report is further shown by the circumstance that Chiya's Agadic sentences were most frequently delivered by Jirmiah (Bacher, *Die Agada der palaestinensischen Amoräer*, II, pp. 178). I consider the whole report of the Babylonian as being of a later date, for the question and answer attached to this report appear anonymous. All these circumstances lead to the assumption that the report in the Babylonian Talmud has its origin in a misunderstanding of Chiya bar Abba's words, and therewith collapses every historical information about an Aramaic version by Onkelos.

But Friedmann endeavours also to uphold de Rossi's opinion, that there had been two Onkelos, an older and a younger one. The only passage alleged in support of this is Aboda Zara, 11 a, and its parallel passages in which it is told that the proselyte Onkelos had burned seventy Mana of frankincense in honour of Gamliel I (גמליאל הוקן); but this passage is not sufficient for the creation of a second Onkelos. Gamliel II must therefore have been meant. It is true, Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, II, p. 61, made the objection that "it cannot be that the younger Gamliel had had such an expensive funeral, because it is told of him (Ketubot 8 b, Moed Katon, 27 b) that he had ordered that he should be buried in as simple a manner as possible." Friedmann attaches great importance to this objection, without considering that the burning of frankincense at a funeral was at all events a Pagan, and not a Jewish custom. Even if it were Gamliel I, Onkelos must have been induced to do what he did by his Pagan notions. If, therefore, he could act in a way opposed to Jewish usage, he also might have disregarded Gamliel's injunction against luxury at funerals.

I think that even after this most recent essay on the subject we may retain the identity of Akylas and Onkelos, as also the other results of modern inquiry discussed here, which are no glittering hypotheses against which youthful students ought to be warned, as Friedmann avers at the end of his essay. I felt more anxious to

subject the opinions expressed in this essay to a searching investigation because I, in common with so many others, have a high regard for M. Friedmann's achievements in all fields connected with the history and elucidation of Jewish literature.

LUDWIG BLAU.

Budapest.

RATNER'S "SEDER OLAM RABBAH."

סדר עולם רבה, *Die grosse Weltchronik. Nach Handschriften und Druckwerken herausgegeben und mit kritischen Noten und Erklärungen versehen*, von B. RATNER. (Wilna, 1897.)

I NOTICED some time ago in this QUARTERLY (*J. Q. R.*, VII, 348) the excellent introduction by Herr Ratner. I am happy to see now the text of this ancient chronicle, edited by the same author, with the variants of the MSS. and quotations from Talmudic literature. These supply the variations of the Munich MS. of the Talmud, which we could not furnish for the text of the *Seder Olam* in the *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, II, pp. 26-67. Herr Ratner has thus filled up a lacuna, besides adding many quotations from printed books, bearing upon our subject. I should have liked to see a table of abbreviations of the titles of the works quoted, which many readers will find a difficulty in deciphering, more especially as Ratner's work will remain for a long time the standard edition. Perhaps a table of abbreviations might be published separately.

BACHER'S "EXEGESIS OF MAIMONIDES."

Die Bibelepexese Moses Maimūni's, von Prof. Dr. WILHELM BACHER, Budapest, 1896. (Jahresbericht der Landes-Rabbinerschule, 1895-1896.)

PROF. BACHER is indefatigable; his minimum yearly production is a volume of essays or the equivalent. The present monograph of 176 pages is an instalment of the programme for the year 1891-1892, with the title of *Die Bibelepexese der jüdischen Religionsphilosophen des Mittelalters vor Maimūni*. Both are interesting by themselves, as well as separately; it is to be hoped that it will be continued some other time, so as to have the subject complete. Our author is well known for accuracy in his statements, depending on texts and expanding them until the meaning comes forth by itself. He calls as his witnesses the very words of Maimonides, be it in Arabic or in Hebrew, for Prof. Bacher is master of both languages. By this learned method Maimonides' exegesis, if we may call it so, becomes